

to include the term “configuration,” which merely clarifies the existing term, “construction,” and is therefore not new matter. Applicants submit that both terms, “construction” and “configuration,” are known to those skilled in the art and do not require further definition. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 1-10 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiriara et al. (US 5,339,247). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites a parts selection reporting system comprising, *inter alia*, a “configuration display data generating means generating a display data including a switching command for switching to a part classification display screen image including individual parts together with said list of parts.” Kiriara et al. does not disclose this limitation. Kiriara et al. discloses that “client WS 3 obtains the parts shape information from its own terminal ... and obtains the parts shape information from the client WS 4 ... and forms display data and displays on the display.” Col. 8, ln. 16-18 (emphasis added). There is no configuration display data generating means generating a display data including a switching command for switching to a part classification display screen image as recited in claim 1. Since Kiriara et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 3 are not anticipated by Kiriara et al.

Claims 4, 7, and 10 recite a parts selection reporting program or method comprising, *inter alia*, “in said configuration display data generation step, providing a display data including a switching command to said parts classification display screen image including individual parts together with a list of said parts.” Kiriara et al. does not disclose this limitation. Kiriara et al. discloses that “client WS 3 obtains the parts shape information from its own terminal ... and obtains the parts shape information

from the client WS 4 ... and forms display data and displays on the display." Col. 8, ln. 16-18 (emphasis added). There is no configuration display data generation step providing a display data including a switching command to said parts classification display screen image as recited in claims 4, 7, and 10. Since Kiriara et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claims 4, 7, and 10, claims 4, 7, and 10 are not anticipated by Kiriara et al. Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 4 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above.

The present invention is different from Kiriara et al. in that the command for retrieving the respective category from the parts classification database is embedded in the results-display on the screen as shown in the step represented by reference numeral 502 in Figure 5 of the specification.

In addition, claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, "product configuration reverse tree display data generating means for displaying upper level assembly and/or product using designated parts or assembly in tree form." Claims 5 and 8 recite, *inter alia*, "product configuration reverse tree display data generating step of reading out the product configuration data from said product configuration storage means and displaying upper level assembly and/or product using designated parts or assembly in tree form." Kiriara et al. does not disclose these limitations. Kiriara et al. discloses an algorithm for retrieving a child-parts based on a parent-parts as shown in Figure 5 of the specification. However, this does not necessarily mean that Kiriara et al. has disclosed such an algorithm that a parent-parts is fetched to display a reversely developed configuration tree as shown in the step represented by the reference numeral 905 in Figure 11 of the specification of the present invention.

Consequently, features stated above leads to the fact that the present invention is different from the art in Kirihara et al. in terms of structure of the art and construction of algorithm steps. These differences of the present invention offers such an effects as enables the system or the method to retrieve parts of the same type and those products in which parts of the same type are involved. Therefore, the present invention definitely provides inventive and patentable steps. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-10 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: February 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &  
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants